IFS Off for Viet Nam, See P. 4

Perhaps NATO Should Have Sent Paratroops to Keep Nguyen Dwight Ike in Power

"Suppose that our allies in Europe are working with the Eisenhower Administration, and then there is a change of government. Is this regarded as a great loss of face on their part, that the people of the United States decided to elect President Kennedy, for example?"

—Under Secretary of State Ball, sweating it out on CBS Face the Nation April 10 in an effort to prove that all was for the best in Saigon.

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. XIV, NO. 15 APRIL 18, 1966 WASHINGTON, D. C. 15 CENTS

Biggest CIA Operation Since the Bay of Pigs?

The biggest blank spot in press coverage of the Vietnam crisis is just what happened in the provincial elections held there last May. A fuller picture of that experiment in elections might help to explain why distrust of the military is so strong that of the 170 leaders the Generals invited to the National Political Congress only 92 showed up. "Later in the day," Beverly Deepe reported (*New York Herald-Tribune,* April 13), "one prominent politician moved that the conference be dissolved—and the attendance dropped to 70." The opening session was boycotted not only by the Buddhists but by Father Hoang Quynh, leader of the bitter-ender Catholic refugees from the North, on whom the U.S. Embassy had been counting as a pro-war "Third Force." The Viet Cong may be a minority, but when you add to it the Buddhists and Father Quynh's following, it should be clear that this is one head count we have already lost.

How to Stack The Cards In Advance

The elections of last May take on triple significance at this moment. First they were a sample of what to expect if the military hold elections. Secondly they throw some light on the rather murky charge that the Buddhists want "Buddhist controlled elections." This sounds very crass, expressed as it is in the news dispatches. It becomes more understandable if it is only an invidious way to describe Buddhist demands that conditions be set assuring that the elections would not be rigged in advance. Thirdly, the military want the country's Constitution to be drafted by a Constituent Assembly made up half of men appointed by the military junta and half of provincial councillors elected in last May's election. This would stack the cards, and determine what kind of elections would be held and what kind of government would be elected. The Buddhists want the Constitution to be drafted by a popularly elected Assembly.

Free elections require more than an honest count. There must be freedom of speech and press to discuss the issues. There must be freedom for political parties to put up candidates. Though State Department representatives have been boasting vaguely of last May's elections in Congressional hearings, no one has been astute enough to question them about the conditions under which they were held. Very little can be found about these elections in the U.S., French or British press. We do know that freedom of press and speech was not restored for the election campaign and we do know that no political parties were allowed to operate and put up candidates. To have lifted the lid would have been to risk some unsettling debates about peace, about absentee landlordism and about the corrupt and high-handed conduct of many South Vietnamese military leaders. Just how the candidates were chosen has never been explained. But we did find one tantalizing glimpse of the realities in *Le Monde* last May 22. It published an *Agence France Presse* dispatch quoting the *Saigon Daily News* as saying that in the provincial elections slated for May 30 candidates would not be allowed to seek "personal publicity" nor to give interviews, with the exception of those "controlled by the government." Campaigns in which candidates cannot speak freely are hardly free elections, and candidates so elected are hardly the best men to write a free Constitution.

The whole idea of leaving the writing of a Constitution in the hands of men picked by this military junta is an affront. These generals are mercenaries. Most of them fought for the French against their own people, and some like Ky in the French Air Force against the Algerian nationalists (Jerry

(*Continued on Page Four*)

U.S. Intelligence in Action I

Mr. Sander VANOCUR: Mr. Bundy what are the Buddhists in South Vietnam, and what do they want?

Mr. Wm. P. BUNDY (Ass't Secretary of State for Far East Affairs, just back from Asia): It's I think misleading to speak of 'the Buddhists' as though you were speaking of a single group. . . . There are the groups centered in Saigon, who are led by Thich Tam Chau . . . the more moderate one that wants to get ahead with the Constitution and the rest. That's Tam Chau. The other which is associated and I think led by Tri Quang, wants to accelerate the timetable very, very much.

—On NBC's Today *show, April 8, transcript made available at State Dept. to alert the press that Thich Tam Chau was the "good guy" among the Buddhists.*

Saigon, April 9 (UPI)—The Buddhist Church today declared virtual war against the tottering government of Prime Minister Ky. Buddhist leaders met at the Vien Hoa Dao Pagoda late today and issued a communique [which] . . . called on all Buddhists to form a nation-wide "struggle force" against Ky's government. The communique was signed by the head of the Buddhist Institute, Tam Chau.

—Washington Daily News, *April 9.*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

More Kafka Than Jefferson in The "Reform" of Shadowing Americans Abroad

How Secretary Rusk (Or the Pixie in Him) Conned Senator Teddy Kennedy

We never suspected the Secretary of State had a secret sense of humor until we began to dig into his reply to Senator Ted Kennedy (*D., Mass*) in the Stuart Hughes affair. In a letter to the Secretary March 23, Senator Kennedy asked, "What is the basis of authority for the Passport Office to request embassies to undertake investigations of private U.S. citizens travelling abroad?" In his reply of April 5, Secretary Rusk cited U.S. Code, Title 5, sections 22 and 151. When we looked them up, Section 151 turned out to be:

"Establishment of Department: There shall be at the seat of government an executive department to be known as the Department of State, and a Secretary of State, who shall be the head thereof."

Section 22 said:

"The head of each department is authorized to prescribe regulations, not inconsistent with law, for the government of his department, the conduct of his officers and clerks, and the distribution and performance of its business and the custody, use and preservation of the records, papers and property appertaining to it. This section does not authorize withholding information from the public or limiting the availability of records to the public."

We learned that both statutes, except for the final sentence of section 22, were enacted on July 27, 1789, when the present government of our country was first organized. We doubt whether those who framed them ever dreamed that they might some day be cited as authority for the secret surveillance of American citizens abroad. It is a pity Senator Kennedy did not look up the Code for himself before his Senate speech April 5 discussing the Rusk reply. He would have realized that he was being conned.

The last sentence of Section 22 has relevant history. It was added to the original 1789 statute in 1958 as a result of recommendations from the Moss freedom of information subcommittee of the House. Every time Moss and his investigators found the Department was withholding information from the public, and asked the Department to cite authority for this censorship, the Department would always come up with Section 22. Section 22 was no more intended to authorize the withholding of information than the shadowing of travellers. It is, however, on just such vague statutory meat that our bureaucratic Caesars feed. It was effrontery of the Department to cite these two statutes as authority and it showed how asleep-at-the-switch the Senate is that Rusk was allowed to get away with it.

The reaction of the Senate was characteristic. Though we are always raising billions for the defense of freedom somewhere or other abroad, there is nothing to which our legislators are more yawningly indifferent than any question of civil liberties. So Rusk's letter and Kennedy's speech, though both were made available in advance, elicited no comment on the Senate floor. They were treated as if they involved a routine chore for a constituent.

Yet major questions were raised by the Rusk letter and the Kennedy statement. In the first place the letter disclosed in reply to one of his questions that last year diplomatic posts abroad were asked to report on "approximately 150" U.S. travellers.

What is the nature of the surveillance to which the 150 were subjected? The Rusk letter said "the diplomatic post simply forwards any information it may receive from items appearing in the local press, reports that may come to the attention of the post, or other routine receipt of information." Knowing the Department's talent for the disingenuous, it is naive to translate this (as most newspaper accounts have) into the statement that the Embassies merely provided press clippings on the suspected persons!

If Only Mack Sennett Were Still Alive

Do the diplomatic posts abroad have their own retinue of political informers? Is this what is meant by "other routine receipt of information"? How are the reporting activities of the diplomatic posts coordinated with the reporting activities abroad of CIA men, FBI operatives, military intelligence attaches and men assigned abroad by the State Department's own Bureau of Intelligence and Research, one of our 12 known U.S. gumshoe agencies. Indeed how do they keep from tripping over each other?

These are questions which ought to be asked in a Senate Foreign Relations committee investigation. The progress in electronic listening devices and the proliferation of our huge intelligence bureaucracies are so great that secret surveillance at home and abroad are now part of the American Way of Life. An occasional inquiry by a Senate committee, however, might help to keep this Orwellian cancer within some bounds.

The Rusk letter has been hailed as providing some restrictions. These turn out on examination to be worth very little. Rusk wrote Kennedy that in the future the Justice Department would ask surveillance of citizens abroad "only in cases where an important national interest would be served." The request would be initiated in Justice and handled at State "by a responsible official." This is still the faceless world of Kafka not due constitutional process. There is not a property interest in the country which would permit itself to be regulated by such unseen, unknown and unchallengeable procedures.

Senator Kennedy, after his own conferences at State Department, disclosed that within the last year "certain students, certain artists, persons considered controversial and even distant relatives of persons considered controversial have been singled out for special treatment", i.e. for special surveillance while abroad. A Senate committee ought to examine all such cases.

"There have been instances," Senator Kennedy told an empty Senate chamber, "in which travellers have been preceded by cables describing their beliefs not because of evidence of direct communist affiliation, but because of an anonymous Passport Office employe's evalaution of the person's views. I do not believe, Mr. President," he added rhetorically, "that we can continue to rely on the ability of low level governmental employes to define what is good American thought."

This implies that it's alright for the government to decide what's "good American thought" so long as this is done by high-level officials! This resounding anti-climax is the most disappointing part of this disappointing story.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

As LBJ's Daddy Told Him

Lyndon Johnson loves to talk about loving the people. Down in San Antonio before Easter, he talked about how he used to follow his Daddy around "barefoot . . . in the hot sand . . . squeezing the dirt up between my toes" and how his Daddy told him, "Son, if you are to speak for people, you must know them, and if you are to represent people, you must love them." Mr. Johnson seemed bathed in self-approval, as if in warm molasses. We would have found the words more touching if he had spared a moment earlier in the week for the homeless Mississippi Negroes who camped for four days at Lafayette square across from the White House, hoping for some response to the telegram for help they had sent him. Their visit was an event. For the first time in our history, black sharecroppers from Mississippi, forced off the land by mechanization and crop control, had gone all the way to Washington to dramatize their plight. Their appearance was a tribute to the poverty program. For all its shortcomings, it had created enough hope to make these people feel such an effort was worthwhile. They felt, for the first time in their lives, as if they were citizens, too, who could come up and see the President.

We believe that a Lincoln or a Roosevelt would have found some way to greet them, sent out hot coffee, or even of an evening walked over and asked them why they came and how they were doing. Lyndon Johnson likes to talk of being just folks. To have walked over and talked with them would have really been in that Populist tradition Johnson likes to claim for his own. "We may be back," a spokesman for the Negroes said as they left, "because our faith in America has only been toughened, not tarnished." Johnson lost an opportunity. For once he might have been the real thing. We wonder whether he thought about it as he was riding the range over his ranch during the Easter week-end as he loves to do, in his big white Continental, just a simple chrome-plated 8-cylinder cowpuncher at heart, body custom made.

The Corruption of Scholarship by Our Well-Heeled Intelligence Establishment

State and Pentagon replies to members of Congress asking more information on the Vietcong have been referring them to George A. Carver, Jr.'s, "The Faceless Viet Cong" in *Foreign Affairs* for April. They do not explain, however, that Carver is a CIA man. There were protests to *Foreign Affairs* last year for failing to disclose Carver's CIA connections when it published an earlier article of his, "The Real Revolution in South Vietnam" (April, 1965). Chalmers M. Roberts in the *Washington Post* March 18 said Carver "is currently an officer of the Central Intelligence Agency" *Foreign Affairs* editors decline to confirm or deny this. They identified him both times as "student of political theory and Asian affairs, with degrees from Yale and Oxford; former officer in the U.S. aid mission in Saigon; author of "Aesthetics and the Problem of Meaning." Ex-CIA Chief Allen W. Dulles is on the advisory board of *Foreign Affairs*. The article might more honestly have been billed "The Faceless Viet Cong, by a CIA Man in False Face." Such failures to disclose pollute scholarship. There is no way of knowing whether a scholar is his own man, or spokesman for the secret police. The process may have gone further than most of us suspect.

Our James Bonds at Work

"Shortly after World War II, while recruiting writers for the new Russian language section of the Voice of America, I tried to engage an old Russian socialist well known for his intimate knowledge of and violent opposition to Stalin's Communism. The FBI and State Department security agents, however, refused him clearance. 'We found socialist literature in his desk,' they said. 'It was even written in Russian!'"

—Charles W. Thayer, a veteran of the U.S. Foreign Service, reviewing "The Case of Richard Sorge" in the Washington Post, *April 12.*

Ramparts for April discloses how Michigan State served as a cover for a $25 million, 6-year operation, in support of Vietnam's late dictator, Diem. Harry Howe Ransom in *The New Republic* (Dec. 11 "Containing the CIA") revealed that the Center for International Studies at MIT "was at its founding financed in part" by the CIA. Scholarship, too, ought to have its conflict-of-interest ethics. But how to get young men to resist the lush pastures the CIA can make available for the kind of scholarship it wants?

What the Booming Business in Napalm Means Here—And What It Means There

"The Air Force's napalm-B program is rapidly beginning to shape up as a big outlet for polystyrene. Last week United Technological Center (Sunnyvale, Calif.) was awarded an Air Force contract to supply 100 million pounds of the new napalm, which contains 50% polystyrene.

"This is the Air Force's third procurement in the secrecy shrouded program in the past 18 months . . . and by far its largest. U.S. production of straight polystyrene hovered around 60 million pounds per month in 1965. Dow Chemical has just raised the price of the monomer one cent. ["In the defense world the laws of economics," the reader who sent us this item commented, "like the laws of reason and of humanity, seem suspended—when quantity increases, price goes up!"] . . . The Air Force has clamped a tight security lid on the napalm-B program, chiefly because of fear of picketing by antiwar demonstrators. Such demonstrations already have been staged at United Technology."

—Chemical and Engineering News, *weekly organ of the American Chemical Society, March 14.*

"There were sometimes two in a bed; now and then, three. They were peasants of all ages, badly battered. Abdominal wounds were numerous, inflicted by bullets, shell-bursts or bombs, grenades or mines. 'Half inflicted by the Vietcong, half by the Vietnamese or the Americans,' a Vietnamese hospital doctor told me. 'Those you see here are those who were able to come. For every one who can reach a town, there are 10 who die in the village or the fields or wherever they are struck. This is true above all of the badly burned.'

"There were several of the 'napalmed.' An old man, whose torso and arms disappeared under heavy bandages. A young girl with her face frightfully swollen and bespattered with burns. A little chap, 12 years perhaps, who was finishing his convalescence in a wheel-chair: at the end of his legs, there were only some sort of fearful reddish stumps, all that remained of his poor feet destroyed by napalm."

—Robert Guillian, describing a visit to a hospital in Central Vietnam, Le Monde, *March 12.*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A Social Revolution in Which the Big Landlords Are Left Undisturbed

(*Continued from Page One*)

Tallmer in *N. Y. Post*, April 3). It is no accident that "our boy" in this situation is a General who not only regards Hitler as his hero but was dumb enough to say so. And Adolf Hitler—if we may slip the CIA some hot poop—was not just a Jefferson with a mustache. Ky would like to put off elections as long as possible. Even at this moment he is incautious enough to give the German newsweekly, *Der Spiegel*, (*Reuters*, April 12) an interview saying that free elections could not be held until 75 to 80% of the country was pacified. That might take five years, or it might take 10. McNamara told the Senate supplemental appropriations hearings earlier this year that Ky told him that his regime only controlled about 25% of the people, and McNamara told Senator Mansfield at those hearings he thought this "a much more realistic appraisal" than the 53% "our field representatives" claimed.

Strange Kind of Revolution

Ky told *Der Spiegel* elections must wait on the success of the pacification program. This was the subject of a CBS special we saw last night. The give-away in this show was that for all the repeated talk of bringing about a social revolution in the countryside not one word was said about land reform, or even lower rents for the peasants, and not one word about electing village councils. One honest U.S. adviser, asked whether the CIA-trained "Rural Reconstruction" teams were as good as the Viet Cong, said "not yet" and added that the difference was that our teams didn't have a program! How do you make a revolution in a peasant country without taking a position on the land question? When you stand with the absentee landlords and their military men against the landless? Charles Collingwood admitted the new program is a lot like those we heard about in the past. Diem's brother, Nhu, had a private army of bully boys, hotel dicks and right-wing mystics who were going to bring about a "revolution" in the countryside, also without disturbing the landlords. These new teams, Mr. Collingwood said, were the CIA's own revolutionaries and represented "the biggest CIA operation since the Bay of Pigs—and hopefully more successfully." We hope President Johnson saw that program, and remembered Kennedy's experience. The secret police apparatus which turned up on the anti-peasant side and guessed wrong in Guatemala, Cuba and the Dominican Republic isn't going to bring about a social revolution in Vietnam.

Johnson was the victim of bad intelligence when he linked his prestige with Ky's at Honolulu. The answer of the military-intelligence bureaucracy to another resounding failure is to step up U.S. bombing in the North. Like panicky gamblers, they're going for broke. They'll have us in a war with China rather than admit their bankruptcy in Vietnam. The best thing which could happen to us would be the election of a representative government in Saigon, ready to negotiate an honorable peace and a neutralist solution. *April 13*

U.S. Intelligence in Action II

"There's been no sign that any of these movements, bar a very occasional slogan that is inserted by some really extreme fellow, have anything to do with not going ahead with the war or not being opposed to Communism."

—Ass't Sec. of State for the Far East Bundy, just back from Saigon, on NBC's Today show, April 8.

"Two keys explain the demonstrations now taking place in Vietnam. The first is that the population as a whole wants peace, as soon as possible. It knows peace would probably mean, sooner or later, a Communist regime. But today the choice is clearly between surviving with the Vietcong or letting the Americans continue their destruction of Vietnam, in the name of liberty and democracy. No Vietnamese today thinks that this war is his. The majority think it an affair exclusively American, a settling of accounts between Washington and Peking which, unhappily, takes place on their territory. . . . They do not pardon the Americans for killing without much discrimination anyone who is yellow on the pretext that he might well be red, and for having converted Saigon into a gigantic brothel [lupanar] for the relaxation of the soldier. Desire for peace and hostility to the Americans are the two points which coincide exactly with the Vietcong program."

—Max Clos (just back from Saigon) in the pro-U.S. French daily, Le Figaro, April 4.

IFS Leaving for Vietnam—As Usual With Foreign Assignments the Weekly Must Suspend for Two Weeks to Make This Trip Possible—Next Letter from Saigon

I. F. Stone's Weekly 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W. Washington, D. C. 20015

Please renew (or enter) a sub for the enclosed $5:

Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

4/18/66

For the enclosed $5 send a gift sub to:

(To) Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

For $5.35 extra send I. F. Stone's *The Haunted Fifties*

Indicate if announcement wished ☐

I. F. Stone's Weekly

5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.

Washington, D. C. 20015

Second class postage paid at Washington, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED